

**RAPID RESPONSE CONTRACT
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REPORT**

***ACF SOUTHEAST HUB
TANF DATA COLLECTION AND
REPORTING WORKSHOP***

**July 31 – August 2, 2001
Atlanta, GA**

Prepared by:

Blake Austensen
AFYA, Inc.
6930 Carroll Avenue, Suite 1000
Takoma Park, MD 20912
(301) 270-0841

Submitted in accordance with:
IDIQ No. 105-98-8403
Task Order #48

“Reporting accurate and timely data is critical this year with TANF reauthorization coming up soon. TANF data tells a story--resulting in truth and consequences.”

Sean Hurley
Director

Division of Data Collection and Analysis
Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. OVERVIEW.....	4
II. PARTICIPANTS.....	5
III. SESSIONS.....	5
A. Opening Session.....	5
B. General Reporting Requirements.....	9
C. Final TANF Data Report – Section One: Disaggregated Data Collection for Families Receiving Assistance Under the TANF Program.....	11
D. Work Participation Rate Documentation.....	19
E. Waiver Exceptions and Separate State Program-MOE Reporting.....	20
F. Final TANF Data Report – Section Two: Disaggregated Data Collection for Families No Longer Receiving Assistance Under the TANF Program.....	21
G. Final TANF Data Report – Section Three: Aggregated Data Collection for Families Applying For, Receiving, and No Longer Receiving Assistance Under the TANF Program.....	21
H. Final TANF Data Report – Section Four: Number of Families by Stratum for States that Report Data Based on a Stratified Sample.....	22
I. Sample Plan Requirements: Chapters 1300 & 1400.....	22
J. Final Data Report Transmission.....	23
K. Caseload Reduction Credit.....	24
L. High Performance Bonus.....	26
M. Final Questions and Answers.....	31
IV. WORKSHOP EVALUATION	32
APPENDIX A: Agenda	
APPENDIX B: Speaker List	
APPENDIX C: Participant List	
APPENDIX D: Evaluation Form	

RAPID RESPONSE CONTRACT

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WORKSHOP SUMMARY

Event: ACF Southeast Hub TANF Data Collection and Reporting Workshop

Date: July 31 – August 2, 2001

Location: Atlanta, GA

I. Overview

The Administration for Children and Families (ACF), Region IV, Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) hosted this 2 1/2-day workshop to provide a technical assistance discussion forum about data collection and reporting for representatives from Region IV states as well as Federal representatives from Region IV and the Central Office. The overall objective of the workshop was to provide Region IV states with technical assistance to comply with the reporting requirements contained in the final TANF regulation. Throughout this intensive work session, the definitions and interpretations of the more difficult data elements of the required TANF-related data reports were clarified.

Specific areas of focus included: the TANF Data Report, the Separate State Program (SSP)/Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Report, the High Performance Bonus, and the Caseload Reduction Credit. This summary highlights the main points from the workshop presentations and the subsequent discussions. Each participant was provided with a *Data Collection and Reporting Workshop* binder as a reference. Included in this binder were the “Instructions and Definitions” and reporting form for each Section of the TANF Data Report and the SSP-MOE Data Report. Therefore, the description of, and instructions for, each data element in the Data Reports will not be reported in this summary as that information is available in the workshop binder. Instead, this report will cover the discussions and questions surrounding specific data elements or concepts. The workshop *Agenda* is included at the end of this report as Appendix A.

II. Participants

The workshop was attended by 34 participants—including representatives from all eight Southeast Hub states, the Regional Office, and Central Office. The *Speaker List* and the *Participant List* are included at the end of this report as Appendix B and Appendix C, respectively.

III. Sessions

A. Opening Session

1. **Ken Jackson, Deputy Director, Southeast Hub, ACF, HHS**
2. **Greg Campbell, TANF Program Manager, TANF Program Manager, Region IV, ACF, HHS**
3. **Sean Hurley, Director, Division of Data Collection and Analysis, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, ACF, HHS**

Mr. Ken Jackson, Southeast Hub Deputy Director, opened the workshop by thanking everyone for attending. He also thanked the Central Office representatives in particular for their participation. He went on to compliment the states in the Region for doing an excellent job in data collection and reporting. Without accurate data, he pointed out, “The Region could not do anything!” He closed by commending states for seeing the importance of data collection, as reflected by the fact that all states in the region were represented, and wished everyone a successful workshop.

Next, Mr. Greg Campbell, Region IV TANF Program Manager, welcomed the participants. He also thanked them for attending the workshop and commented on the good work states were doing in the area of data collection and reporting. As facilitator, he reminded participants that this was their opportunity to ask specific questions to the Central Office staff members who review their data that they report to Central Office. Although the workshop binder is full of information, he went on, it may not have an answer to a specific question or circumstance that they are currently struggling with in regards to collecting and reporting data. He closed by emphasizing that the workshop was set up to be an informal dialogue between Central Office and Region IV states, and he encouraged participants to ask as many questions as they wanted.

Mr. Sean Hurley, Division of Data Collection and Analysis/OPRE/ACF/HHS, rounded out the welcome session by bringing welcoming comments from Central Office. He offered opening remarks to participants that addressed three areas: the purpose of data collection, the success of welfare reform to date, and the issue of TANF reauthorization.

He began by providing background information on data collection and reporting as it relates to welfare reform. He listed the two major purposes of data collection and reporting as:

1. To determine the success of the TANF program in meeting the purposes of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) (i.e., are adults being employed?, how are families faring?, and what are outcomes for children?); and
2. To assure accountability (of work participation rates, time limits, and state MOE expenditures).

He went on to point out that under the law, TANF has certain data collection and reporting requirements. He noted that consistency of data is very important. Data collection allows a comparison of state data across states and over time. It also offers an understanding of what is happening nationwide. In effect, Mr. Hurley stressed, data tells a story. It allows states to share their story of welfare reform in their state. However, this story, he reminded states, tells the truth and will have consequences.

Next Mr. Hurley commented on the national story of welfare reform that is reflected in the data reported in the last several years since the TANF program began. Work has dramatically increased and caseloads have fallen dramatically. Caseloads have been reduced by 59%, from 14.1 million to 5.8 million. Poverty among children has declined. However, he noted, states still have to address the issues of client's continuing economic struggles, devolution, and public and community support.

In addition, there are still remaining challenges for states as they implement welfare reform. One of these challenges is in the area of wages. Clients are finding work that pays above minimum wage, but these wages still keep them below the poverty level. Another major issue is

what is collectively referred to as the “hard to serve.” These clients face multiple barriers to work. Mr. Hurley cited the following statistics about current welfare clients.

- 30% have a mental health diagnosis or substance abuse addiction
- 25-40% of adults have learning disabilities
- 15-20% of adults and 15-20% of children have developmental disabilities
- 15-20% of women are subject to domestic violence each year, with 60% over their lifetime

In addition to the above statistics, he mentioned that work skills and education deficits are still an issue for a large number of clients. In addition, limited English proficiency remains an issue for many clients.

In response to some of these challenges, Mr. Hurley commented that states are launching new and innovative policies. There has been an increased recognition of the needs of low-income families outside of the welfare system. In response, States have implemented the following types of initiatives.

- Post-employment supports for working families that have left assistance, but with low wages
- Families who could avoid assistance with other help (diversion)
- Reaching out to low-income working families that may never have received TANF assistance
- Targeted activities to help fathers, youth, and children
- Efforts to reduce out-of-wedlock pregnancies, encourage the formation of two parent families
- Services/benefits often available up to 200% of poverty

The Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Mr. Hurley continued, has conducted various research projects on family outcomes. “Leaver” studies have indicated that work has few negative consequences for well-being, and offer little evidence that families are suffering. Information related to these are available on the OPRE web site at www.acf.dhhs.gov.

Accountability and data issues that Mr. Hurley suggested states pay close attention to included: MOE Expenditures/New Spending Test, Reasonable Cause, Caseload Reduction Credits, Domestic Violence Waivers, Single State Audit findings, TANF Goal three and four

activities, and Diversion programs. A national study is currently underway, by OPRE, to evaluate clients who have been diverted from assistance.

Finally, while discussing welfare reform's success, Mr. Hurley addressed the states' Annual Report. This year the reports are due December 31, 2001. The report, he stressed, is a way for states to fill in the blanks and provide additional information about how they are doing with welfare reform. In the past, Central Office has found a "disconnect" between what is reported and what is on the state's TANF plan (i.e., state MOE spending does not match, etc.). This year, with reauthorization coming up, he emphasized to states that the accuracy of this report is critical. He suggested to states that they consider their Annual Report to be their "report card."

The last topic Mr. Hurley addressed was reauthorization. He discussed the current TANF and MOE funding levels and mentioned that Congress could change these significantly. Non-assistance expenditures, he said, will become more of an issue in the future. The main reason for this is because no data is currently collected on it. A state's Annual Report is the only place it shows up as an expense deducted from the state's total annual TANF block grant. All TANF expenditures, he continued, are either assistance or non-assistance. Assistance (payments to meet a families ongoing basic needs for food, clothing, shelter, etc.) expenditures are subject to TANF time limits, data collection, and other requirements. Non-assistance (non-recurrent, short-term benefits, supportive services to employed clients, IDAs, EITCs, work subsidies, and services) has fewer restrictions and can provide a range of opportunities to help families outside of the traditional welfare system. In the future, there will be an increased need for data on services, benefits, and clients to support funding arguments.

Another reauthorization issue Mr. Hurley shared was that the overall four purposes of TANF may be debated. He believes some new debate topics will emerge in Congress as well as a renewal of some of those that came up during the passage of the initial legislation. Some of the debated modifications to the purposes of TANF that he suggested may surface follow below.

- Poverty reduction
- Address the needs of the working poor
- Allocation for marriage, family formation, and preventing non-marital births
- Focus on the "next generation"—child/youth development

- Encourage services for non-custodial parents, father engagement

Next, Mr. Hurly discussed time limits. He said that it is difficult for OPRE to gauge the impact of time limits for two reasons: States have their own time limits that vary and the earliest time limits set will not have been reached until late 2001 and early 2002. Discrepancies between states about exemptions, extensions, and what counts as a time limit make cross state comparisons difficult. He told the group that OPRE is currently conducting a national study on the effects of time limits.

Measurement of performance is another reauthorization issue that he shared with participants. Measurement benchmarks will be debated (i.e., participation rates vs. caseload reduction or outcome vs. process). The amount of data collection and reporting, penalty reductions, and reasonable cause and corrective compliance will all be issues to be considered in light of performance measurement.

The last issue for reauthorization that Mr. Hurley shared with the group was that of safeguards and whether they are adequate. Important debates may come up on issues such as effective diversion strategies vs. right to apply, sanctions, right to services, individualized benefits vs. equitable treatment, Food Stamps and Medicaid, and Child Welfare.

There was no time for questions.

B. General Reporting Requirements

This summary below describes the general reporting requirements of the TANF Final Rule. The reporting requirements are addressed in Section 265 of the TANF Final Rule. Quarterly data reports are due 45 days after the close of each quarter. The TANF Data Report contains four main sections:

- Section One: Disaggregated Data on Families Receiving TANF Assistance - 76 data elements including identifying information, family-level data, and person-level data;
- Section Two: Disaggregated Data on Families No Longer Receiving TANF - 30 data elements;

- Section Three: Aggregated Data for Families Applying For, Receiving, and No Longer Receiving Assistance - this section addresses caseload data; 18 data elements including identifying information on applications, active cases, and closed cases; and
- Section Four: Number of Families by Stratum for States that Report Data Based on a Stratified Sample - 5 data elements; Four states in the Southeast Hub are using sampling which is addressed in this section of the report.

“Section One: Disaggregated Data on Families Receiving TANF Assistance”, comprises the bulk of the TANF Data Report. Disaggregated reports contain detailed information on each individual family, whereas aggregated reports contain details on caseload data. Furthermore, sampling is allowed for disaggregated reports.

The Final Rule requires that reports be transmitted electronically. Last year was the “start-up” year for electronic reporting.

The following criteria are used to determine if a state is meeting the quarterly reporting requirements:

- Has it been filed by due date?
- Is it complete?
- Is data accurate?

The ACF Central Office can use audits and review to verify the accuracy of the data submitted.

States must maintain records to adequately support any report they file. There are some penalties for states that fail to submit complete, accurate reports. The penalty may be up to 4% of their State Family Assistance Grant (SFAG) per quarter.

It is important to note that the TANF Financial Report is entirely different from the TANF Data Report. The Financial Report was not discussed in this workshop.

More information about TANF data collection and reporting is available on the questions posted among the Questions and Answers on the OFA website at <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofa/polquest/index.htm>. Copies of questions on this web site as of June 6, 2001, were included in the workshop binder. In addition, helpful websites are listed in the binder.

C. Final TANF Data Report – Section One: Disaggregated Data Collection for Families Receiving Assistance Under the TANF Program

Patrick Brannen, Senior Program Analyst, Division of Data Collection and Analysis, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation (OPRE), ACF, HHS

Mr. Brannen welcomed participants and commended the states in Region IV for taking the time to attend the conference and focus so closely on the topic of data collection and reporting. As the OPRE team leader for developing the TANF Data Report and SSP-MOE Data Report, he brought a wealth of experience to the workshop discussions. In his introductory comments, he encouraged states to ask questions, and he said he would share real life examples of what states have done well and not so well in the many aspects of data reporting. In the same spirit of assistance, he committed to offer helpful advice to states whenever possible throughout the workshop.

He then reviewed each data element in the “TANF Data Report – Section One: Disaggregated Data Collection for Families Receiving Assistance Under the TANF Program” using the corresponding “Instructions and Definitions” as a guideline. He stated that he would provide the federal perspective of the data elements and encouraged the participants to ask questions. Mr. Brannen emphasized that the Central Office/OPRE is concerned about the timeliness and accuracy of the data submitted by states. Similar to earlier speakers, he stressed the importance of this timeliness and accuracy given that TANF reauthorization is in the near future.

There are three levels of data for reporting purposes: caseload-level data, family-level data and person-level data. Person-level data is broken down into two sections: (1) the adult and minor child head-of-household characteristics section, and (2) the child characteristics section.

A case can be uniquely identified by using certain data elements. According to the Final Rule, “For data collection and reporting purposes only, the definition of a *family* is:

- (1) All individuals receiving assistance as part of a family under the State’s TANF or separate State program (including noncustodial parents, where required under §265.3[f]); and
- (2) The following additional persons living in the household, if not included under (1) above:
 - (i) Parent(s) or caretaker relative(s) of any minor child receiving assistance;
 - (ii) Minor siblings of any child receiving assistance; and
 - (iii) Any person whose income or resources would be counted in determining the family’s eligibility for or amount of assistance.”¹

The definition of “assistance” arose as it relates to reporting requirements. The definition of assistance is found in Article 260.31 of the TANF Final Rule. According to the guidance provided in the “Instructions and Definitions” for the TANF Data Report, “The term ‘assistance’ includes cash, payments, vouchers, and other forms of benefits designed to meet a family’s ongoing basic needs (i.e., for food, clothing, shelter, utilities, household goods, personal care items, and general incidental expenses.)” It includes such benefits even when they are provided in the form of payments by a TANF agency, or other agency on its behalf, to individual recipients and are conditioned on their participation in work experience or community service, or other work activities (i.e., under the CFR §261.30.) Except where excluded as indicated in the following paragraph, it also includes supportive services such as transportation and child care provided to families who are not employed. The term ‘assistance’ excludes:

- (1) Nonrecurrent, short-term benefits (such as payment for rent deposits or appliance repairs) that:
 - (i) Are designed to deal with a specific crisis situation or episode of need;
 - (ii) Are not intended to meet recurrent or ongoing needs; and
 - (iii) Will not extend beyond 4 months.

¹ 64 FR 17900

- (2) Work subsidies (i.e., payments to employers or third parties to help cover the costs of employee wages, benefits, supervision, and training);
- (3) Supportive services such as child care and transportation provided to families who are employed;
- (4) Refundable earned income tax credits;
- (5) Contribution to, and distributions from, Individual Development Accounts;
- (6) Services such as counseling, case management, peer support, child care information and referral, transition services, job retention, job advancement, and other employment-related services that do not provide basic income support; and
- (7) Transportation benefits provided under an Access to Jobs or Reverse Commute project, pursuant to section 404(k) of the Act, to an individual who is not otherwise receiving assistance.

The exclusion of nonrecurrent, short-term benefits under (1) [above] also covers supportive services for recently employed families, for temporary periods of unemployment, in order to enable continuity in their service arrangements.”²

If states provide benefits or services that do not meet the definition of assistance in Section 260.31, i.e. non-recurring, short-term assistance other than cash, they do not have to include those families in their Disaggregated Data Report. Therefore, states can invest in working families by providing services and supports other than cash and not include them in their federal rate reporting. However, Mr. Brannen pointed out that states may choose to collect their own data on these families to evaluate the results of their investments. Mr. Greg Campbell, Region IV TANF Program Manager, told the group that the Regional office is closely reviewing the distinction between assistance and non-assistance funding as it has a large impact on data collection and reporting.

² 64 FR 17905

A question related to the last exclusions of assistance (transportation benefits provided under an Access to Jobs or Reverse Commute project...to an individual who is not otherwise receiving assistance) came up about the inconsistencies with tracking transportation funding. Mr. Brannen advised participants that funds are considered non-assistance if they are not given specifically to an individual. For example, funds for a bus route would be considered non-assistance. He suggested everyone refer to the questions and answers on the OFA web site for further guidance.

In light of data element #8: *Funding Stream*, Mr. Brannen pointed out that this data element needs to be considered very carefully in light of the definition of assistance and whether the assistance provided to a family is from co-mingled, segregated, or separate state funds. This coding has impact on the family's time limit.

While discussing data element #10: *New Applicant*, Mr. Brannen stated that for the first month in which a person receives assistance in a particular state, they are considered a New Applicant for that state's database. At this time, there is no federal tracking mechanism for tracking TANF recipients across states relative to the federal time limit. At this point, such tracking is left up to the states.

Mr. Brannen emphasized that data element #12: *Type of Family for Work Participation* is a key item in this report. It identifies whether the family will be used to calculate both the all families and two-parent families work participation rates, will be used to calculate only the overall work participation rate, or will not be used to calculate either work participation rate.

In considering data element #'s 15: *Receives Food Stamps* and 16: *Amount of Food Stamp Assistance*, Mr. Brannen reminded participants that these numbers need to be in line. In the past, he said states have entered that a family is receiving Food Stamps but did not enter in the amount. He also emphasized that this data element only applies to TANF families that receive Food Stamps and not just households in receipt of Food Stamps.

For data element # 18: *Amount of Subsidized Child Care*, he suggested that states carefully consider all the sources (federal or state) of funding to or on behalf of a parent (or caretaker relative).

Several questions arose around data element # 21: *Cash and Cash Equivalents* about paying for a family's utility bills and how to handle changing family compositions. When asked if this block included utility payments, Mr. Brannen said yes. In response to a follow-up question about tracking, he suggested states consider using the "other assistance" block. However, he reminded participants that he is not a policy speaker and cannot respond to state questions concerning policy. In response to another follow-up question, he suggested that states count the month that the assistance was provided and not the month it was authorized (i.e., this relates to when the bill is due vs. when the state provided actual assistance). Another participant asked about how to track and report a single mother who marries and her spouse was on assistance. In this case, Mr. Brannen cautioned states not to double count the months of assistance for this new family.

On data element # 22: *TANF Child Care*, a question arose about whether this is considered assistance or not. Mr. Brannen advised participants to pay close attention to whether a family is employed or nonemployed and when this status changes during a particular month. By definition, a TANF child care benefit that is received by an employed family is not assistance and should not be reported in this data element. However, unless excluded by a non-recurring, short-term benefit, a TANF child care benefit that is received by a non-employed family is assistance and should be reported here. He did point out that this can be difficult to track because of flexibility allowed in how states define work activities (i.e., working at an unsubsidized job, etc.).

Data elements # 23: *Transportation* and #24: *Transitional Services*, Mr. Brannen pointed out, are similar to #22 in that close attention needs to be paid to if, and when, a family is employed during a particular month. This determines whether a use of funds is assistance or non-assistance.

With regards to data element #26.b: *Reason for and Amount of Reductions in Assistance/Recoupment of Prior Overpayment*, a participant questioned whether the following counts as a month on assistance:

A client should receive \$100 grant for the month. However, they have a \$100 recoupment due to a past overpayment, so they received no cash benefits that month.

States were advised to code the situation above as follows: element #21, enter \$0; item 26b, enter \$100. According to Sean Hurley, Division Director, Division of Data Collection and Analysis, OPRE, the above situation would be counted as a month of assistance for purposes of the federal time limit. It was further clarified that a recoupment is not considered a reduction of assistance.

Another policy discussion ensued relating to data element # 28: *Is the TANF family Exempt from the Federal Time-Limit Provisions*. The discussion was in regards to codes # 1 and #2 and the tracking of heads of households. A participant questioned whether both parents could be considered as head of household. Mr. Brannen commented that the TANF regulation does not strictly define head of household. States are allowed flexibility. One state shared with the group that they had coded both parents, who were not married but living together, as head of household. They went on to share with the group that this reporting did not result in an error flag from Central Office.

In trying to determine how to identify/code a case with respect to time limits, new child-only status, etc., Mr. Brannen instructed participants to consider the client's or case's history within their particular state only. With no federal interstate tracking mechanism currently in place, at this time, what may have happened with that client/case in one state does not have an impact on determining the status of a case within another state.

Mr. Brannen pointed out that the number of child-only cases is rising. He suggested the need to examine the reasons behind this trend. Two contributing factors may be the movement of the adult caretaker relative to SSI or parental attempts to avoid work participation

requirements. Data element #29: *Is the TANF Family A New Child-Only Family?*, considers a new child-only family to be a TANF family that: “(a) has received TANF assistance for at least 2 months (i.e., the reporting month and the month prior to the reporting month); (b) received benefits in the prior month, but not as a child-only case; and (c) is a child-only family for the reporting month.”³

There was an extended discussion pertaining to the Person-Level Data in Section One of the TANF Data Report. Specifically, participants expressed confusion as to how to code adults and minor child head-of-households. Data element #30 *Family Affiliation* was the center of this discussion. Mr. Brannen clarified some definitions for participants. An adult is an individual that is not a minor child. A minor child is an individual who either has not attained 18 years of age, or has not attained 19 years of age and is a full-time student in a secondary school (or in the equivalent level of vocational or technical training). He noted that there have been instances where states forgot to take into consideration that the child was over 18 but still in school before they coded the child as an adult. He went on to clarify that a minor child who is either a head-of-household or married to the head-of-household should be coded as an adult and be referred to as a “minor child head-of-household.” For each adult (or minor child head-of-household) in the TANF family, the adult characteristics section should be completed. Several participants asked what they should do if they did not code these individuals as adults (coded them under child characteristics). Mr. Brannen suggested that states redo these sections for their FY 2001 data.

A question was raised about how to code an adult in a particular situation for data element #31: *Noncustodial Parent Indicator*. The participant asked how to code an adult who is a member of a family receiving assistance and is also a noncustodial parent of another child whose family is receiving assistance. Mr. Brannen suggested the individual should be coded separately as part of the family he lives with that is receiving assistance.

In reference to data element #34: *Race/Ethnicity*, Mr. Brannen noted that some families will have multiple races that a reviewer may have to consider for one individual when coding this element. He emphasized that states must select one category only for data purposes and that

³ 64 FR 17906.

the system will not accept two answers or an omission for this element. Two states raised the question of how to handle a coding when the individual refuses to offer his or her race/ethnicity. Apparently, this is usually an issue for individuals receiving nonassistance who feel they do not need to comply with any state requirements. Again, Mr. Brannen reminded states that this could be a policy question where states could apply their own judgement. One possibility is to allow the reviewer to make the decision. He encouraged states to advise their reviewers to work cooperatively with clients and assure them that this information is being collected only for data purposes.

It was noted by participants that there may be inconsistencies between the information entered for data element #47: *Employment Status* and #64: *Amount of Earned Income* for newly employed or newly unemployed persons. For instance, a newly employed person may start working in a particular month but may not receive a paycheck until the following month. Conversely, a person who has just lost his/her job may have earnings for that month but be unemployed. Mr. Brannen emphasized that, when OPRE analyzes the data, such an inconsistency would trigger a consistency edit but it would not be considered a fatal error. In addition, he advised states to make sure their information in this data element is consistent with data element #49: *Unsubsidized Employment*.

Noting that data element #48: *Work Participation Status* is a very important element, Mr. Brannen acknowledged that coding this element presents a dilemma in the case of two-parent families because it uses a single-parent basis. Each parent is coded separately. The documentation for extracting data reads the file and determines if it is a two-parent case. Two-parent cases are not coded as couples. See coding in items 11, 12, and 30. It was noted that some states are placing all two-parent cases in a SSP-MOE program. The state is still required to submit a report for that program. The SSP-MOE Data Report is similar to the TANF Data Report, but it has some differences. Apparently, separate SSP-MOE reporting is relatively easy to do unless cases have to be retroactively uncoupled from the overall caseload. Therefore, if states are planning to place all two-parent families in their SSP-MOE program and report separately, it was recommended that they start with the present instead of the past.

The most important point for states to keep in mind for this data element, Mr. Brannen said, was for states to ensure that the individual being coded has adequate hours to count as work participation. He reminded states that they should count exact hours and not estimates. States, he went on, should refer to their state TANF plan for definitions of work activities.

In discussing the child characteristics of Section One, Mr. Brannen said that this section has very similar issues as the adult characteristics part of Section One. In reference to data element #74: *Educational Level*, he again reminded participants that a child who is not yet 19 and still in school can be coded as a child. Many state participants reflected that most of their problems in coding this data element centered on the individual's age, head of household status, and their educational level.

D. Work Participation Rate Documentation

Patrick Brannen, Senior Program Analyst, Division of Data Collection and Analysis, OPRE, ACF, HHS

Mr. Brannen began by providing a brief overview of the work participation rate documentation process. He then mentioned some specific examples that would cause an error flag in coding and walked participants through the calculations he does for each case. He did this for both the “all families rate” as well as the “two-parent rate.” Next, he provided a step-by-step review of the documentation for a series of three programs that were written to calculate the work participation rates from State data reported in the Final TANF Data Report. Please refer to the workshop binder for the detailed documentation. For the “all families rate”, count all TANF families with an adult or minor child head-of-household, except for those who are explicitly disregarded. Families may be disregarded from the all families work participation rate if:

- (1) the family has a single custodial parent with a child under 12 months;
- (2) a member of the family is subject to sanction for refusing to engage in work activities for the reporting month, but the family has not been disregarded from the work participation rate for more than 3 months within the preceding 12-month period because a family member was subject to a sanction for refusing to engage in work activities; or
- (3) an adult (or minor child head-of-household) is participating in a Tribal Work

Program and the State has opted to exclude the families with a Tribal Work Program participant from its work participation rate.

For the “two-parent rate”, count only two-parent families with an adult or minor child head-of-household, except those who are explicitly disregarded. Families may be disregarded from the two-parent work participation rate if:

- (1) one (or both) of the parents is subject to sanction for refusing to engage in work activities for the reporting month, but the family has not been disregarded from the two-parent families work participation rate for more than 3 months within the preceding 12-month period because a parent refused to engage in work activities; or
- (2) the two-parent family has one (or both) of the two parents participating in a Tribal Work Program and the State has opted to exclude the families with a Tribal Work Program participant from its two-parent families work participation rate.

One participant asked if a stepparent could be considered one of the two parents. Mr. Brannen said yes as long as the individual was in line with the state’s definition. Another participant asked if there was anything in general that is unique to Region IV in relation to work participation rate. Mr. Brannen said he has not observed any discrepancies between Region IV and the rest of the country.

E. Waiver Exceptions and Separate State Program-Maintenance of Effort Reporting

**Patrick Brannen, Senior Program Analyst, Division of Data Collection and Analysis,
OPRE, ACF, HHS**

Mr. Brannen did not go into too much detail in this workshop session. In general, waivers had to be granted under 1115 prior to the signing of PRWORA in 1996. Waivers may apply to time limits, work activities, and/or exemptions. In addition, states with waivers have additional work activities. In Region IV, the states of South Carolina and Tennessee have waiver exceptions. No questions were raised by representatives from these two states nor from any other states.

In regards to the separate state program-maintenance of effort reporting, Mr. Brannen reflected that the instructions on coding this data for each of the four sections are very similar to those for their corresponding TANF Data Report's four sections. Two questions were asked during this session. One participant asked if a state can report a work participation rate for a large county. States may do this if they choose to, but it requires a change to the normal data programming. Another participant asked about using Federal money for non-qualified aliens. Mr. Brannen pointed out that only state money can be used for these individuals. He compared data element #38 Citizenship/Alienage on the state's separate state program-MOU to the same data element (#42) of the TANF Data Report. Item #42 does not even list non-qualified aliens.

F. Final TANF Data Report – Section Two: Disaggregated Data Collection for Families No Longer Receiving Assistance Under the TANF Program

Patrick Brannen, Senior Program Analyst, Division of Data Collection and Analysis, OPRE, ACF, HHS

Section Two of the Final TANF Data Report relates to closed cases. Please see the workshop binder for detailed instructions and definitions for this section of the report. One question was raised about the number of reasons for case closure, data element #9: *Reason for Closure*. If a state has more reasons than those listed in the instructions, they should choose the appropriate reason from the list of choices available. Mr. Brannen commented that these reasons will be reconsidered during TANF reauthorization. Mr. Sean Hurley, Division Director, Division of Data Collection and Analysis, ACF/OPRE, followed up by mentioning that OPRE is always looking for suggestions from the states on how to improve this data element.

G. Final TANF Data Report – Section Three: Aggregated Data Collection for Families Applying For, Receiving, and No Longer Receiving Assistance Under the TANF Program

Patrick Brannen, Senior Program Analyst, Division of Data Collection and Analysis, OPRE, ACF, HHS

Please see the workshop binder for detailed instructions and definitions for this section of the report. There was participant comment that data element #4: *Total Number of Applications*, really captures the total number of dispositions versus applications, because it does not take into

account pending cases. Mr. Brannen also pointed out that for data element #9: *Total Number of Two Parent Families*, there is no definition of a two-parent family in the TANF statute. For data element #11: *Total Number of Two Parent Families*, a participant asked if a grandmother could be included as a caretaker relative as head-of-household. Mr. Brannen said yes that individual could be included as part of the count of no-parent families. The last question raised was about births and data element #16 *Total Number of Births* and #17 *Total Number of Out-of-Wedlock Births*. In response to how to report a birth that is discovered after the month in which the child was born, Mr. Brannen suggested the state code the birth in the actual month it took place.

H. Final TANF Data Report – Section Four: Number of Families by Stratum for States that Report Data Based on a Stratified Sample

Patrick Brannen, Senior Program Analyst, Division of Data Collection and Analysis, OPRE, ACF, HHS

Mr. Brannen reviewed the “Instructions and Definitions” and the reporting form for Section Four of the Final TANF Data Report. Please see the workshop binder for detailed instructions and definitions for this section of the report. For Region IV, the states that report data based on a stratified sample are Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina. States that do this should submit a sampling plan to the regional office that should remain in effect for one year. Mr. Brannen went on to discuss sampling issues in the next workshop session.

I. Sample Plan Requirements: Chapters 1300 & 1400

Patrick Brannen, Senior Program Analyst, Division of Data Collection and Analysis, OPRE, ACF, HHS

Mr. Brannen briefly discussed sampling issues and reviewed the TANF Sample Plan Requirements, Chapters 1300 & 1400, as contained in the workshop binder. He commented that sampling is to a state’s advantage, but the key is to ensure that the sample represents all of the people whom the state has served. He suggests states maintain their sampling records for three years. One participant asked if the state can submit a list to the region for help or suggestions. Mr. Brannen said the region could look on the state’s web site to do this. All that would be

needed would be for the state to give the region the appropriate password and other access directions. He also said that central office is also available to help states.

Options for selecting a sample include:

- Random sampling – the simplest form of sampling, but it is problematic because it does not guarantee a representative sample;
- Systematic sampling – a variation of simple random sampling; and
- Stratified sampling – if a state submits the quarterly data based on a stratified sample, the state also must submit the number of families by stratum for each month of the quarter.

J. Final Data Report Transmission

Paul Hasz, Team Leader, Division of Application Development Services, Office of Administration, ACF, HHS

Paul Hasz presented to the group and demonstrated the ACF Final TANF Data Reporting System software. He said that this software is now being used by all the Tribes, Territories, and many states. In region IV, South Carolina and Mississippi currently use it. The software allows users to collect data on their own system and run edit checks similar to the ones OPRE runs when it receives data from states. The software can be downloaded directly from the OFA web site at <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofa/ftandrs/>. The software is contained in a self-contained extracting executable file that can be used immediately. Other features of the software that Mr. Hasz described are the bulk save/delete feature, queries (some that OPRE wrote are available), and data error analysis (allows states to determine what edit is problematic). The file transfer protocol (FTP) process, he told participants, is still under development. States can also log onto the OFA site and run a history report of aggregate data. All that would be required for states to do is have a user i.d. and a password. This information, along with the URL, will be given to the regional office from central office Mr. Hasz said.

Mr. Hasz went on to demonstrate different features of the software and even connected to the OFA web site for further demonstration purposes. One participant asked about security issues. He responded that the application OPRE uses encrypts data first as soon as the file transfer is received. This protects social security numbers for individuals being reported. In

response to a follow-up question, he said that the system prompts users to encrypt. He advised participants to avoid encrypting twice by accident. He went on to point out that there are three ways to code the Update Indicator on the software: N for new data, U for update data, and D for delete data. States should pay attention to how files are sent and avoid sending different sets of data files. The system may overlay existing data files if subsequent files are sent. An alternative method that he recommended is to send the files completely separate from each other and to run a history report first. A participant asked how long it takes to run a history report. Mr. Hasz said it takes overnight usually to get this report. The last issue he addressed was the transmission of High Performance Bonus data. This data will be collected semiannually. The software that OPRE will provide is similar to the TANF Data Reporting System software that Mr. Hasz demonstrated. He told participants that the HPB software is currently being tested and should be available in the next month.

K. Caseload Reduction Credit

Julie Siegel, Program Specialist, Division of Program Development, OFA, ACF, HHS

Julie Siegel explained that the Caseload Reduction Credit (CRC) was created by Congress in the TANF statute [407(b)(3) of the Social Security Act] and is a credit toward a State's participation rate for reducing its TANF caseload. The CRC reduces the State's minimum participation rate for a year by the actual caseload decline between the prior year and 1995, minus the net caseload decline due to eligibility changes and Federal requirements. Caseload declines due to eligibility changes do not count toward the credit. However, increases due to eligibility changes are added back into the caseload so that the net effect of eligibility changes is used. Ms. Siegel pointed out that the CRC can never be greater than the actual decline.

The CRC is calculated based on the caseload data reported by the States combined with data on the effects of changes in eligibility. The Caseload Reduction Report, Form ACF-202, is used to collect data on a State's eligibility changes. Part I of the form lists all eligibility changes after FY 1995, implementation dates, and estimated impacts on the caseload. Part III of the form asks for the State's methodology and supporting documentation. Ms. Siegel emphasized that it is important for states to "show their work" and "tell us what they are thinking" in Part III so that

the ACF Central Office can better understand what thought processes the states used to arrive at their estimates.

Ms. Siegel described some of the biggest problems in calculating the CRC which include:

- **What year goes on the report?** The year to which the credit applies even though prior year data is being used to arrive at the CRC.
- **Caseload data differences.** Caseload data must match the data reported on the ACF-198 or allowable adjustments must be explained.
- **Calculating caseload impacts.** The impact of an eligibility change should take into account the effect of the policy on the caseload for the fiscal year. When an eligibility change is made, it has a continuous impact. The effect of the change over time must be taken into account. Therefore, effects within the fiscal year and effects from previous fiscal years must also be considered. If states have policies with overlapping effects on eligibility, they can be bundled together and predictions can be done for all of the bundled policies together.
- **“Decaying” the effect of eligibility changes.** Carrying over the full effect of a change each month may overstate its true impact. So, states are allowed to adjust the estimate for a more accurate impact as long as they have a rational basis for the decay and they explain it in detail in Part III of the ACF-202. Use of the “decay” rate is optional. The decay rate methodology is very important for future years. The types of accepted methodologies include rate of returns and separate study.
- **Handling Tribal TANF cases.** A state cannot get credit for caseload declines due to a Tribal TANF program. The state must treat it as an eligibility change or remove similar cases from the FY 1995 caseload, if that data is available.

Ms. Siegel explained that FY 2000 was a milestone because that is when the data reporting regulations took effect. However, she pointed out that states are probably aware of many of these changes because most have already submitted their paperwork for FY 2001. As a review, she highlighted the following regulatory changes:

- **Separate State Program cases.** The caseload must include SSP cases. The SSP caseload should be shown separately from the TANF cases so that the Central Office can see that they add up.

- **SSP exceptions.** With the proper documentation, SSP cases that duplicate TANF cases and non-qualified alien SSP cases will be excluded from the caseload data.
- **Child-only cases.** Child-only cases must be included in the caseload data. In the past, states were allowed to exclude that data.
- **Sanctions and behavioral requirements.** New full-family sanction and behavioral requirement policies are eligibility changes.

In closing, Ms. Siegel informed the participants that OFA is considering issuing additional CRC guidance and improving the ACF-202 form and instructions. She welcomed comments and input about what would be most helpful for users of these materials. One participant questioned the usefulness of Part II of the form. Ms. Siegel responded that, although they originally thought they would use Part II as a check for the rest of the information on the form, Central Office has not used this Part as much as they thought they would. However, it would require a regulatory change to exclude Part II from the form as the TANF Regulations require this to be part of the form. When asked when the new CRC guidance will be released, Ms. Siegel commented that it is overdue and should be out soon. As part of this process, she went on, OFA wants to support states and assist them in obtaining their CRC. She also added that TANF reauthorization will have a definite impact on the future of CRC.

Examples of prior suggestions as to future guidance that would be useful to states include the following:

- A list from the ACF Central Office on the types of policy changes that states are claiming as having an impact on caseload declines or increases.
- Examples from states that did a good job of showing how they came up with their caseload decline/increase numbers that result from policy changes.

L. High Performance Bonus

Sean Hurley, Division Director, Division of Data Collection and Analysis, OPRE, ACF, HHS

Sean Hurley began the session by providing background information on the High Performance Bonus (HPB) the authority for which is provided in Section 403(a)(4) of the Social

Security Act. It provides for one billion dollars in High Performance Bonus awards from FY 1999 through FY 2003 to states with high performance in meeting the four goals of TANF. The initial year bonus specifications, which focus on work measures only, were developed in consultation with States and others and were issued as guidance. This guidance covered the years FY 1999 to FY 2001. Focusing on work measures only, the initial bonus categories were:

- Job Entry Rate;
- Success in Work Force Rate;
- Increase in Job Entry Rate; and
- Increase in Success in Work Force Rate.

In FY 1999, 46 states competed for HPB awards providing new employment data: 1.3 million adults on welfare went to work during that fiscal year; 80% of those who had gotten jobs were still working 3 months later; and there was a 23% average increase in earnings for welfare recipients between the first quarter of employment and the third quarter. These significant results are reflective of many states doing well in their efforts to move people from welfare to work. Twenty-seven states received HPB awards in FY 1999.

Mr. Hurley then went on to compare the program's results of FY 1999 to FY 2000. The results of the first two year's of the program are summarized below.

High Performance Bonus Results FY 1999 – FY 2000

- States competing: 46 vs. 49
- Job entries: 1.3 M vs. 1.2 M
- Job entry rate: 38.7% vs. 42.9 %
- Job retention rate: 80% vs. 76.8%
- Earnings gain rate: 34% vs. 22%
- Average earnings gain: \$483 vs. \$464

In June 2000, the Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network sponsored a workshop to examine the strategies used by states that won HPB awards. The final report from these proceedings can be found at the Peer TA website at www.calib.com/peerta. In reviewing the state employment strategies of the HPB recipients, it appears that they focused on moving clients from welfare to work through a variety of strategies. These strategies do not appear to have been designed around the HPB work measures, but around their program goals that are consistent with the HPB criteria. Strategies included a variety of marketing techniques, work supports, culture change, focus on outcomes, and an emphasis on interagency collaborations. Mr. Hurley recommended that states start tracking what they are doing and the impact that they are having to more closely track the effects of various employment strategies.

The goals of the HPB system are to:

- meet statutory requirements;
- reflect principles developed in consultation with states and others;
- be based on measurable outcomes;
- use the most uniform, objective, and reliable data available; and
- recognize state achievements in several areas.

A Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM), which included bonus awards for three non-work measures, was published December 6, 1999. The Department received 130 comments from national, state, and local agencies and organizations. In the comments, there was broad support for the work measures and significant support for a new child care measure.

The Final HPB Final Rule was issued in the Federal Register on August 30, 2000, and were effective October 30, 2000, except for Section 270.4(e)(2)(ii) which will be effective at a date to be determined later. Section 270.4(e)(2)(ii) addresses changes in reimbursement rates for CCDF services. The Final HPB Rule covers the HPB for FY 2002 and FY 2003. It specifies the performance measures as the work measures, measures that support work and self-sufficiency, and a measure in support of family formation and stability. The Final Rule also addresses data

sources, data reporting, and funding allocation formulas related to the HPB Awards. The HPB Final Rule provides for the following annual bonus allocation:

- \$140 million to work measures;
- \$20 million to Food Stamp measures;
- \$20 million to Medicaid/SCHIP measures;
- \$10 million to the child care measure; and
- \$10 million to the family formation measure.

The work measures as specified in the Final Rule are substantially the same work measures as are currently in effect for the 1999-2001 awards with minor modifications including:

- calculating the improvement measures from percentage change to percentage point change;
- using equal weighting of retention and earnings gain in determining success in work force rate (instead of the current use of double weight for retention); and
- other technical changes.

The Final Rule also provides for the use of the National Directory of New Hires (NDNH) to reduce the reporting burden on those states competing on the work measures. The NDNH includes wage data from all states and all federal employment data.

Performance measures that support work and self-sufficiency related to: participation by low-income working families in the Food Stamp Program, participation of former TANF recipients in the Medicaid and State Children's Health Insurance Programs (SCHIP), and receipt of child care subsidies, are also included in the HPB Final Rule. For both the Food Stamp measure and the Medicaid/SCHIP measure, the Final Rule provides for three awards based on a respective absolute measure and seven awards based on a respective improvement measure. The Final Rule also eliminated the proposed qualifying conditions and options that were proposed for both measures in the NPRM. Competition for the Food Stamp measure uses census data as the

population measure, while competition for the Medicaid/SCHIP measure is based on state administrative data. In FY 2002, a new, multi-weighted component measure will be used for the child care measure and competition will be based on an absolute measure. The child care measure focuses on child care accessibility (the percent of CCDF-eligible children receiving services), affordability (comparison of family co-payments to family income), and child care quality (based on State reimbursement rates) using data States currently report under the CCDF program. The Final Rule established a consultation process for defining the child care measure for FY 2003. The Interim Final Rule for the child care measure was released, after consultation, on May 10, 2001.

Finally, performance measures related to family formation and stability are included in the HPB Final Rule. The family formation and stability measure gauges the increase in the percentage of children in the State who reside in married couple families. It bases competition on a universal population, using census data and is awarded based on an improvement measure only.

The HPB Final Rule has reduced the reporting burden for states in the following ways:

- It requires no reporting for Food Stamp and Family Formation measures.
- It requires no additional reporting for the FY 2002 Child Care measure.
- It reduced the reporting for Work measures.
- It provides for a waiver of certain SSP-MOE reporting.

For those bonus areas in which no reporting or no additional reporting is required, States will need to notify OPRE regarding the bonus areas in which they wish to compete.

In closing, Mr. Hurley outlined the next steps relative to the HPB Awards. He stated that OPRE needs to provide specifications for work measure data in terms of what data the states need to provide to OPRE and in what format they need to provide it. OPRE will be providing software to states within the next month to assist with states' semi-annual data transmission process. He reminded everyone that the data is a three tiered process: The FY 2001

bonuses will be based on FY 2000 data, and the improvement criteria will be based on FY 1999 data. Future submission dates to keep in mind are September 2001 (transmission of qtr. 1 and qtr. 2 FY 2001 data) and March 2002 (transmission of qtr. 3 and qtr. 4 FY 2001 data). Mr. Hurley encouraged all states to participate in this year's HPB Award competition. Finally, Mr. Hurley noted that there will be an annual review of the HPB award process.

The discussion that followed centered around operational issues for the FY 2001 bonus and related data transmissions. One participant asked if the semi-annual data transmission for two quarters should be sent as separate months. Mr. Hurley stated that they should either be sent as one or two files (one quarter each or combined). Another person asked if OFA makes comparisons between the HPB data reported to OPRE and the TANF data they receive. Patrick Brannen said yes, but the issue is how to make the data comply. Given the way the data is collected (different time periods for each transmission), this presents a challenge for states. When asked what states can expect to receive with the new data transmission software, Mr. Hurley replied that states will receive instructions along with a sample file.

M. Final Questions and Answers

This final session of the workshop was very brief. One participant asked about the data differences between the TANF and High Performance Bonus reporting. Sean Hurley, Division of Data Collection and Analysis/OPRE/ACF/HHS, responded that HPB data is collected across months while TANF data is collected for each month. This means the numbers for HPB should be higher than those for TANF. In response to a follow-up question about when to report HPB data, he advised states to wait for OPRE to notify states and send out the HPB reporting software. The final discussion of the workshop was about the Final TANF Data Reporting System software. Paul Hasz told participants that central office is encouraging input as to how to revise the software to help states report more accurate and timely data in the future. A workgroup, made up of representatives from fifteen states and three regions, is currently reviewing the software.

Greg Campbell, ACF Region IV TANF Program Manager, closed the workshop by thanking both the participants and the speakers. He suggested that any further questions participants may have should be e-mailed to Jim Patty (TANF/child care program specialist) at the regional office. Mr. Patty will forward questions on to the appropriate recipient in order for states to get the answers they need.

IV. Workshop Evaluation

At the conclusion of the workshop, attendees were asked to complete an evaluation form to determine the effectiveness of this workshop and to assist the planning committee prepare for future events. A summary of those evaluations as prepared by the ACF Region IV office is included below.

The following summary is taken from 23 Evaluation Forms that were returned at the end of the Workshop. A copy of the form is attached as Appendix D. Responding comments from the Region IV office are included.

The ratings for all the sessions as well as organization, registration, flow of the day and facilities were all on a 1 to 4 scale with 1 being poor and 4 being excellent. The workshop was well received and the ratings were predominately 4 with most of the rest being 3. Since there were some 2 ratings and some written comments, those will be singled out for whatever value can be gained for future reference.

As for registration and pre-registration, there were several comments, “no one was at the registration table, but it worked out ok”, and “There was no one at the registration table when we arrived to register-not a real problem but we were unsure what to do.” and finally, “We were a little rushed making plans and gaining approval for the travel, but I do understand why there was short notice of the conference.” There was one other mark of 2 for registration but with no comment. Given the short turnaround on conference approval, I think we allowed as much time as possible for travel approval. Given that we had several logistics problems early the first

morning that required the presence of the individual working the registration table, I am pleased that apparently only 3 people were inconvenienced.

Participant binders and resources were a big hit. All were pleased and comments such as “Notebook is great idea!” and “Outstanding material!” “Thank you for putting all this together.” and “Very comprehensive: excellent resource” indicate the binder was well received.

The ratings of the individual sessions were favorable with the exception of one person who gave the Caseload Reduction Credit session a 2 and remarked “No new information, was expecting recent, pertinent information/feedback.” I suspect that when only one of 23 complains that it is generally a good workshop. Other comments on the various sessions were “Very helpful, new information on SCHIP/Medicaid and Child Care measures”; “Welcomed the opportunity to ask questions of the expert”; “Pat Brannen is very amusing and well spoken. He says what needs to be said in concise, simple language.”; “Paul Hasz was a knowledgeable, helpful presenter with a pleasant and humorous introduction”; “You talk just fine, Paul”; “Appreciate opportunity to clear up some issues”; on the subject of the opening topic, one comment was “good introduction and preparation for the topic.”

One evaluation indicated that for the conference “Too much time allowed –workshop could be done in 1 1/2 or 2 days” and another commented that “could have been condensed into fewer days.” This is true but since Region IV had not had any experience with a previous data conference, we expected more questions than we actually received during the workshop. Time was allotted to make sure everyone could go away with the knowledge they needed.

Criticism of the facilities was generally limited, but the meeting set up gathered the most negatives. One evaluation rated the meeting space/setup a rating of 1 but with no comment. Some other expressed comments were, “More interaction/questions/discussion could be encouraged with a less formal room set-up-round tables perhaps. I think that would spur more exchange among the participants that would be productive.”; “uncomfortable chairs, tables a little crowded”; “great refreshments!” Everyone else gave good marks to the facilities.

The ratings of the overall services of the technical assistance providers were very high. Almost all of these were a 5 or 4. One individual rated everyone a 1 (lowest rating) but with no comments. The comments elsewhere on that particular evaluation were good.

The final items were, in order:

3. Describe the benefits to your program that you anticipate as a result of this workshop.
4. Identify what was most useful about this workshop.
5. How could this workshop have better met your needs?
6. Comments.

The responses were good and they were as follows (with their corresponding question):

3. Describe the benefits to your program that you anticipate as a result of this workshop.
 - “Improved transmittals”
 - “Clearer understanding of minor child head of household classification”
 - “I learned about transmissions, which I think will be helpful to technology staff at home. There are/were problems with past data transmission which I hope to prevent in the future. Sampling information may also prove helpful.”
 - “Improved data quality”
 - “Clarification of procedures for High Performance Bonus”
 - “The detail and information provided helped reassure me that we are on track with our data definitions and collection processes-Thanks!”
 - “Better data submitted”
 - “Several key questions were answered-Very beneficial”
 - “More accurate data collection”
4. Identify what was most useful about this workshop.
 - “Details of how system works, fits together”
 - “Identified what is truly expected from us for each section. Identified some discrepancies that we were unaware of”

- “Having access to the real experts who use the data we provide-Plenty of opportunities and time to ask questions”
- “Better understanding of crosschecks between programs”
- “Small size was great for better interaction between speakers and attendees”
- “This workshop clarified some issues that were not clear to my state. The other material that pertained to me was basically just a review”
- “Being able to directly ask questions and interaction with other states and federal staff”
- “See above-and the FTDRS application will be very helpful in making sure our data gets to you in a cleaner form”
- “Tweaking of several items on TANF report and HPB”
- “Questions answered”
- “Question and answer sessions”
- “Clarification of regs. and procedures”

5. How could this workshop have better met your needs?

- “I think it would have been helpful if important points were emphasized more. Some were mumbled and for a policy person, harder to document in conference notes. Distributing conference notes to attendees in a timely fashion may be helpful.”
- “It would have added tremendously if the TANF-annual report instructions were included in the detailed instructions with the other reports”
- “Would have been very helpful if 1 year earlier! Would have avoided mistakes”
- “If this had been held 9 months to 1 year earlier it would have been more useful-most of our questions have been answered previously-still good to get together!”
- “This workshop was needed much earlier in the process after TANF regs became final”
- “If we had had it sooner”
- “Workshop was excellent-wish it had occurred much earlier in the TANF data collection process”

6. Comments

- “Would have been wonderful to have had this type workshop earlier into TANF reporting”
- “Thank you for the conference! Thank Patrick for his stories”
- “You folks did a great job-Thank you for all the effort you went to on our behalf”
- “I would like to see this workshop become an annual event that can be used to address problems or issues of concern regarding TANF reporting, especially after reauthorization”
- “Prefer Westin Peachtree as a conference site”
- “Speakers were extremely knowledgeable on the subject area and kept us entertained also. Overall this was a good session”
- “Keep the question and answer section going on your web page-this section is very helpful! Sean, Paul, and Julie’s information was very helpful. Thanks Pat- For the workshop and all the time you spend with the states on the phone. Thanks SE Hub!”

In summary of the above, the Southeast Data Collection and Reporting Workshop met its goals that were: (1) To provide States in the Hub with the opportunity to meet and ask questions first hand with those individuals in Washington who receive and use the data. (2) To improve the quality of data thereby reducing costs of clean up actions (3) to enable the Southeast States to be on a competitive basis in the High Performance Bonus program. The need for this type workshop has been apparent for more than a year and the States in the Southeast are now better prepared to deal with data issues than ever before. We have learned that a small group in more informal seating would work well and this will be reference in future workshops of this kind.

Appendix A: **Agenda**

ACF Southeast Hub TANF Data Collection and Reporting Workshop
July 31 - August 2, 2001
Embassy Suites Hotel at Centennial Olympic Park
Atlanta, Georgia

Agenda

Tuesday, July 31*

8:00 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.	Registration
9:00 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.	Welcome and Opening Remarks Carlis Williams Southeast Hub Director Administration for Children and Families "Truth and Consequence -- Data Tells a Story" Sean Hurley Division Director ACF/Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation Division of Data Collection and Analysis
9:30 a.m.- 9:40 a.m.	General Reporting Requirements/Introduction
9:40 a.m. - 10:45 a.m.	Final TANF Data Report - Section One: Disaggregated Data Collection for Families Receiving Assistance Under the TANF Program Patrick Brannen Senior Program Analyst ACF/Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation Division of Data Collection and Analysis
10:45 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.	Break
11:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon	Final TANF Data Report - Section One (Continued)
12:00 noon - 1:30 p.m.	Lunch Break

1:30 p.m. - 2:45 p.m.	Caseload Reduction Credit Julie Siegel Program Specialist ACF/Office of Family Assistance Division of Policy and Program Development
2:45 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.	Break
3:00 p.m. - 4:45 p.m.	Final TANF Data Report - Section One (Continued) Work Participation Rate Documentation Patrick Brannen
<u>Wednesday, August 1*</u>	
8:30 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.	High Performance Bonus Sean Hurley Division Director ACF/Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation Division of Data Collection and Analysis
10:30 a.m.- 10:45 a.m.	Break
11:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon	Section One and WPR Documentation, (Continued) Waiver Exceptions Separate State Program-Maintenance of Effort Reporting Patrick Brannen
12:00 noon - 1:30 p.m.	Lunch Break
1:30 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.	Final TANF Data Report Transmission Paul Hasz Team Leader ACF/Office of Administration Division of Application Development Services
3:00 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.	Break

3:15 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Final TANF Data Report - Section Two:
Disaggregated Data Collection for Families
No Longer Receiving Assistance Under the TANF Program

Patrick Brannen

Thursday, August 2*

8:30 a.m. - 10:15 a.m.

Final TANF Data Report - Section Three:
Aggregated Data Collection for Families
Applying for, Receiving, and No Longer
Receiving Assistance Under the TANF Program

Final TANF Data Report - Section Four:
Number of Families by Stratum for States that
Report Data Based on a Stratified Sample
Sampling Issues

Patrick Brannen

10:15 a.m. - 10:45 a.m.

Break

10:45 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

Final Questions and Answers
Wrap-up Session

*The Embassy Suites Hotel provides their overnight hotel guests with a complimentary, cooked-to-order breakfast in Ruth's Chris Steak House (located in the hotel) from 6:00 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.

Appendix B: **Speaker List**

Atlanta, GA
July 31 - August 2, 2001

ACF Southeast Hub TANF Data Collection & Reporting Workshop



SPEAKER LIST

Patrick Brannen

Senior Program Analyst

Administration for Children and Families/OPRE

Department of Health and Human Services

370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW

Aerospace Building, 7th Floor

Washington, DC 20447

Phone: 202.401.5096

Fax: 202.205.3598

Email: pbrannen@acf.dhhs.gov

Paul Hasz

Applications Team Leader

Administration for Children and

Families/Office of Administration/DADS

Department of Health and Human Services

200 Independence Avenue, SW

HHS Building, Room 344F

Washington, DC 20201

Phone: 202.690.7037

Fax: 202.260.3305

Email: phasz@acf.dhhs.gov

Sean Hurley

Director

Division of Data Collection and

Analysis/OPRE/ACF

Department of Health and Human Services

370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW

Aerospace Building

Washington, DC 20447

Phone: 202.401.9297

Fax: 202.205.3598

Email: shurley@acf.dhhs.gov

Julie Siegel*Program Specialist*

Administration for Children and Families/Office of Family Assistance

Department of Health and Human Services

Aerospace Building

370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW

Washington, DC 20447

Phone: 202.205.4777

Fax: 202.205.5887

Email: jsiegel@acf.dhhs.gov

Carlis Williams*Southeast Hub Director*

Administration for Children and Families

Department of Health and Human Services

Atlanta Federal Center

61 Forsyth Street, SW, Suite 4M60

Atlanta, GA 30303

Phone: 404.562.2900

Fax: 404.562.2980

Email: cwilliams@acf.dhhs.gov

Appendix C: **Participant List**



ACF Southeast Hub TANF Data Collection & Reporting Workshop



PARTICIPANT LIST

Blake Austensen

Training Specialist

AFYA, Inc.

6930 Carroll Avenue

Suite 1000

Takoma Park, MD 20912

Phone: 301.270.0841, ext. 215

Fax: 301.270.3441

Email: baustensen@afyainc.com

Sharon Banic

Business Analyst

Office of Information Technology

Georgia Department of Human Resources

2 Peachtree Street, NW

Atlanta, GA 30303

Phone: 404.357.3758

Fax: 404.657.3784

Email: sfbanic@dhr.state.ga.us

Susan Banks

Assistant Director

South Carolina Department of Social Services

P.O. Box 1520

Columbia, SC 29202

Phone: 803.737.9055

Fax: 803.734.4227

Email: sbanks@dss.state.sc.us

Edith Bartlett

Operations & Management Consultant II

Florida Department of Children and Families

1317 Winewood Blvd.

Building 3, Room 468

Tallahassee, FL 32399-0700

Phone: 850.413.6157

Fax: 850.921.1806

Email: edith_bartlett@dcf.state.fl.us

Bill Battle

TANF Program Specialist
Administration for Children and
Families/Region IV
Department of Health and Human Services
Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center
61 Forsyth Street, Suite 4M60
Atlanta, GA 30303-8909
Phone: 404.562.2931
Fax: 404.562.2985
Email: bbattle@acf.dhhs.gov

John Beard, Jr.

Statistical Analyst
Georgia Division of Family and Children Services
2 Peachtree Street
Suite 19-404
Atlanta, GA 30303
Phone: 404.463.7263
Fax: 404.657.3325
Email: jmbeard@dhr.state.ga.us

Freida Brannon

Program Specialist
Department of Human Resources
State of Alabama
50 N. Ripley Street
Montgomery, AL 36117
Phone: 334.242.1977
Fax: 334.242.0513
Email: fbrannon@dhr.state.al.us

Greg Campbell

TANF Program Manager
Administration for Children and
Families/Region IV
Department of Health and Human Services
Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center
61 Forsyth Street, Suite 4M60
Atlanta, GA 30303-8909
Phone: 404.562.2934
Fax: 404.562.2983
Email: grcampbell@acf.dhhs.gov

Elizabeth Carlyle

Program Coordinator II
FI Policy and Program Development
South Carolina Department of Social Services
3700 Forest Drive
Landmark II Suite 300
Columbia, SC 29204
Phone: 803.737.9256
Fax: 803.737.9296

Elizabeth Caywood, CSW*Social Services Specialist*

Kentucky Cabinet for Families and Children

275 E. Main Street, 3W-B

Frankfort, KY 40621

Phone: 502.564.7536, ext. 4222

Fax: 502.564.0328

Email: elizabeth.caywood@mail.state.ky.us

Chris Christmas*Director I*

Mississippi Department of Human Services

P.O. Box 352

Jackson, MS 39205

Phone: 601.359.4828

Fax: 601.359.4550

Email: cchristmas@mdhs.state.ms.us

Linda Finn*Lead Analyst/Developer*

Office of Information Technology

Georgia Department of Human Resources

15 Peachtree Street, 8S33

Atlanta, GA 30334

Phone: 404.651.9870

Fax: 404.651.9741

Email: lfinn@dhr.ga.state.us

Edward Fuller*Section Director*

Georgia Division of Family and Children Services

2 Peachtree Street

Suite 19-226

Atlanta, GA 30303

Phone: 404.657.5129

Fax: 404.657.3325

Email: ejfuller@dhr.state.ga.us

Penelope Gardner*Assistant Director*

Program Quality Assurance

South Carolina Department of Social Services

P.O. Box 1520

Columbia, SC 29202

Phone: 803.737.9020

Fax: 803.737.9063

Donna Gunter*TANF Unit Chief*

DFCS

Georgia Department of Human Resources

2 Peachtree Street, NW

Suite 21-202

Atlanta, GA 30303

Phone: 404.657.3737

FAX: 404.657.3755

E-mail: degunter@dhr.state.ga.us

Patricia Hill

Lead Analyst/Developer

Office of Information Technology
Georgia Department of Human Resources
15 Peachtree Street, 8S33
Atlanta, GA 30334
Phone: 404.651.9870
Fax: 404.651.9741
Email: phill@dhr.ga.state.us

Lynn Horne

Project Administrator

South Carolina Department of Social Services
P.O. Box 1520
Columbia, SC 29202
Phone: 803.737.9046
Fax: 803.734.4225
Email: lhorne@dss.state.sc.us

Darlene Kishbaugh

Statistical Analyst

Georgia Division of Family and Children Services
2 Peachtree Street
Suite 19-105
Atlanta, GA 30303
Phone: 404.657.5127
Fax: 404.657.3325
Email: dbkishba@dhr.state.ga.us

Suzanne Marshall

Assistant Chief

Economic Services
North Carolina Department of Social Services
325 N. Salisbury Street
MSC #2420
Raleigh, NC 27699-2420
Phone: 919.733.7831
Fax: 919.733.0645
Email: suzanne.marshall@ncmail.net

Cecelia Martin

Data Management and Research Administrator

Program Quality Assurance
South Carolina Department of Social Services
P.O. Box 1520
Columbia, SC 29202
Phone: 803.737.9020
Fax: 803.737.9063

Darrel McGhee

TANF/Child Care Program Specialist

Administration for Children
and Families/Region IV
Department of Health and Human Services

Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center
61 Forsyth Street, Suite 4M60
Atlanta, GA 30303-8909
Phone: 404.562.2936
Fax: 404.562.2985
Email: dmcghee@acf.dhhs.gov

Kerry Mullins

Director of Planning and Evaluation
Tennessee Department of Human Services
Families First Unit
400 Deaderick Street
12th Floor
Nashville, TN 37248-7200
Phone: 615.313.5652
Fax: 615.313.6619
Email: kmullins@mail.state.tn.us

Jim Patty

TANF/Child Care Program Specialist
Administration for Children
and Families/Region IV
Department of Health and Human Services
Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center
61 Forsyth Street, Suite 4M60
Atlanta, GA 30303-8909
Phone: 404.562.2955
Fax: 404.562.2984
Email: jpatty@acf.dhhs.gov

Robin Register

Business & Information Systems Liaison
North Carolina Division of Social Services
325 N. Salisbury Street
MSC #2420
Raleigh, NC 27699-2420
Phone: 919.733.4530
Fax: 919.733.7058
Email: robin.register@ncmail.net

Garrett Skelton

Chief
Statistics Unit
Georgia Division of Family and Children Services
2 Peachtree Street
Atlanta, GA 30303
Phone: 404.657.3289
Fax: 404.657.3325
Email: gwskelton@dhr.state.ga.us

Betty Smith

TANF Program Specialist
Administration for Children
and Families/Region IV
Department of Health and Human Services

Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center
61 Forsyth Street, Suite 4M60
Atlanta, GA 30303-8909
Phone: 404.562.2938
Fax: 404.562.2985
Email: besmith@acf.dhhs.gov

Janie Tapp

TANF/Child Care Program Specialist
Administration for Children
and Families/Region IV
Department of Health and Human Services
Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center
61 Forsyth Street, Suite 4M60
Atlanta, GA 30303-8909
Phone: 404.562.2939
Fax: 404.562-2985
Email: jatapp@acf.dhhs.gov

Elizabeth Walker

Program Specialist
Alabama Department of Human Resources
50 Ripley Street
Montgomery, AL 36130
Phone: 334.242.1772
Fax: 334.242.0513
Email: ewalker@dhr.state.al.us

Veronica Young

Program Specialist
Administration for Children
and Families/Region IV
Department of Health and Human Services
Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center
61 Forsyth Street, Suite 4M60
Atlanta, GA 30303-8909
Phone: 404.562.2894
Fax: 404.562.2985
Email: vyoung@acf.dhhs.gov

Appendix D: **Evaluation Form**

SOUTHEAST HUB TANF DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING WORKSHOP

Atlanta, Georgia
July 31-August 2, 2001

EVALUATION FORM

Please complete the following evaluation form so that we may determine the effectiveness of this workshop and prepare for future events.

1. Please rate the following on a scale of 1 to 4 (1=poor; 2=satisfactory; 3=good; 4=excellent):

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| a. Pre-workshop information/registration: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Comments: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| b. On-site registration: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Comments: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| c. Participant binders/resource materials: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Comments: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| d. Workshop organization/flow of day: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Comments: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| e. Session: Opening: "Truth and Consequence" | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Comments: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| f. Session: General Reporting Requirements/Introduction: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Comments: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| g. Session: Final TANF Data Report – Section One: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Comments: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| h. Session: Caseload Reduction Credit: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Comments:

- i. Session: High Performance Bonus: 1 2 3 4
Comments:

- j. Session: Work Participation Rate Documentation/Waiver Exceptions/SSP-MOE Reporting: 1 2 3 4
Comments:

- k. Session: Final TANF Data Report Transmission: 1 2 3 4
Comments:

- l. Session: Final TANF Data Report – Section Two: 1 2 3 4
Comments:

- m. Session: Final TANF Data Report – Section Three: 1 2 3 4
Comments:

n. Session: Final TANF Data Report – Section Four/Sampling Issues:	1	2	3	4
Comments:				
<hr/>				
o. Session: Questions and Answers/Wrap-up:	1	2	3	4
Comments:				
<hr/>				
p. Facility				
Location:	1	2	3	4
Meeting space/set-up:	1	2	3	4
Sleeping rooms:	1	2	3	4
Food services:	1	2	3	4
Overall:	1	2	3	4
Comments:				
<hr/>				
q. Overall Conference:	1	2	3	4
Comments:				
<hr/>				

2. Please rate the overall services of the technical assistance (TA) providers, e.g. facilitators, speakers, etc. Circle the appropriate number on the 5-point scale below (1=lowest rating; 5=highest rating):

		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree	
a. The TA providers were knowledgeable about the content of the TA	1	2	3	4	5
b. The TA providers had adequate background and experience to successfully provide the TA.	1	2	3	4	5
c. The TA provided will be useful to our state/jurisdiction in advancing and/or enhancing TANF implementation.	1	2	3	4	5
d. The expected outcomes of the TA were successfully achieved	1	2	3	4	5

3. Describe the benefits to your program that you anticipate as a result of this workshop.

4. Identify what was most useful about this workshop.

5. How could this workshop have better met your needs?

6. Comments:

OPTIONAL:

Name: _____

Address: _____

Telephone: (Home) _____ (Work) _____

*Please return this evaluation to the Workshop Registration Desk before you leave the workshop.
Thank-you for your participation and comments.*